

### **REMARKS**

Claims 11, 12, 14, 15, 21, 22, 24, and 25 are pending.

Claims 11, 12, 14, 15, 21, 22, 24, and 25 stand rejected.

Claims 11, 12, 14, and 21 have been amended.

### **Specification**

The specification is objected to because of missing related application information. The specification has been amended to include the Serial Number and the status of each related application.

The specification has also been amended to conform with the Figures and correct minor informalities. The amendments related to the Drawing Objections are discussed in more detail below in conjunction with the objections to the Drawings.

No new matter has been added.

### **Drawing Objections**

The drawings are objected under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) and 1.84(p)(5) for informalities relating to consistency between the Description and the Drawings. The Specification has been appropriately amended to correct any inconsistencies. No new matter has been added.

The particular objections under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) and responses thereto are set forth in Table 1 below:

	<b>OBJECTION</b>	<b>RESPONSE</b>
1.	Failure to show in Figure 2 “SQL Server 7”.	“SQL Server 7” refers to a version of SQL Server not to an element number in Figure 2.
2.	Failure to show in Figure 2 “Browsers 14”.	Description, p. 15, line 13 amended to replace “Browsers 14” with -- Browsers 36 and 38--.

	<b>OBJECTION</b>	<b>RESPONSE</b>
3.	Failure to show in Figure 2 “Primary Single Database 24”.	Description, p. 16, line 29 amended to replace “Primary Single Database 24” with “catalog database 10”.
4.	Failure to show in Figure 3 “XML import input 33”	Description, p. 17, line 12 amended to replace “input 33” with “24” so that “XML import 24” is now recited.
5.	Failure to show in Figure 4e “54”	Description, p. 28, line 3 amended to insert “Fig. 4a and” and delete “of Fig. 4e” so that “Referring back to Fig. 4a and decision step 54” is now recited.

TABLE 1

The particular objections under 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5) and responses thereto are set forth in Table 2 below:

	<b>OBJECTION:</b>  <b>The following references characters are not mentioned in the Description:</b>	<b>RESPONSE</b>
1.	Figure 2: “32”	Referred to on p. 13, line 17 as “communication bus 32”.
2.	Figure 2: “16”	Description on p. 15, line 27 amended to recite “with web server 16”.
3.	Figure 3: “24”	Description on p. 17, line 12 amended to recited “XML import 24”.
4.	Figure 4a: “57”	Description on p. 23, line 22 amended to recite “in step 57”.

	<b>OBJECTION:</b> <b>The following references</b> <b>characters are not mentioned in</b> <b>the Description:</b>	<b>RESPONSE</b>
5.	Figure 4a: "58"	Description on p. 26, line 28 amended to recite "and respond to catalog inquiries initiated by extranet buyers at step 58, which is illustrated in more detail in Fig. 4e."
6.	Figure 4c: "57"	Description on p. 23, lines 24-26 amended to recite "A more detailed description of one embodiment of the process flow by which a custom browse hierarchy is generated in step 57 for a particular rule set is illustrated by Fig. 4c."
7.	Figure 4d: "722"	Description on p. 26, line 10 amended to recite "in step 722".
8.	Figure 4d: "728"	Description on p. 26, line 14 amended to recite "in step 728".
9.	Figure 4e: "58"	Description on p. 26, line 28 amended to recite "and respond to catalog inquiries initiated by extranet buyers at step 58, which is illustrated in more detail in Fig. 4e."
10.	Figure 4e: "586"	Description on p. 27, line 20 amended to recite "In step 586, this"
11.	Figure 4e: "588"	Description on p. 27, line 22 amended to recite "In step 588, all descriptive information for each retained SKU is provided a Web page to a

	<b>OBJECTION:</b> <b>The following references</b> <b>characters are not mentioned in</b> <b>the Description:</b>	<b>RESPONSE</b>
		browser of a buyer.”
12.	Figure 7: “144”, “149”, and 150”.	Description on p. 26, line 8 amended to recite “for leaf nodes 149, 150, 144, etc.”

TABLE 2

### **Claim Objections**

Claims 11, 12, and 14 are objected because of claim format formalities. Claims 11, 12, and 14 have been amended to correct the format informalities.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112**

#### **I.**

Claims 11, 12, 21, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The specification specifically states that, “The above embodiments illustrate but do not limit the invention.” Present Application, p. 29, line 9. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully disagree that the steps identified by the Examiner on p. 6, para. 12 of the December 15, 2006 Office Action, are required to be claimed.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

#### **II.**

Claims 11 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph because ““at least one of the items”, “unique subset of items”, and “pared version” lack antecedent basis. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that the antecedent for “at least one of the items in the unique subset of items” is found in the respective preambles of claims 11 and 21, which recite “a primary hierarchy of items, a plurality of custom browse hierarchies for unique subsets of the items in the primary hierarchy.”

Applicants respectfully submit that “a pared version” is not referring to an antecedent.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

ELECTRONICALLY FILED May 15, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

*/Kent B. Chambers/*

Kent B. Chambers  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 38,839